

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

JERRY BLANEY

Plaintiff,

VS.

FIFTH DISTRICT COURT OF
APPEALS

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

NO. 3-10-CV-2516-B

**FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

This case has been referred to the United States magistrate judge for initial screening pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and a standing order of reference from the district court. The findings and recommendation of the magistrate judge are as follow:

I.

This is a civil action brought by Jerry Blaney, a Texas prisoner, seeking criminal charges against unnamed judges of the Fifth District Court of Appeals "for theft of legal documents and refusal in an official capacity to file and rule upon [] legal documents" filed by plaintiff in connection with the appeal of a state criminal conviction.¹ On December 10, 2010, plaintiff tendered a one-page complaint to the district clerk and paid a \$5.00 filing fee. The court now determines that this action should be summarily dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b).

¹ This is the second lawsuit filed by plaintiff in the last three weeks against the Fifth District Court of Appeals. The magistrate judge has recommended that the first case, a mandamus proceeding, be summarily dismissed. *Blaney v. Chief Judge, Fifth Dist. Court of Appeals*, No. 3-10-CV-2370-B (N.D. Tex. Nov. 24, 2010). That recommendation is pending before the district judge.

II.

A district court is required to screen a civil action brought by a prisoner seeking relief from a governmental entity or employee. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). On initial screening, the court must identify cognizable claims or dismiss the complaint, or any portion of the complaint, that:

- (1) is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; or
- (2) seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.

Id. § 1915A(b). To state a claim upon which relief may be granted, plaintiff must plead "enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face[.]" *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570, 127 S.Ct. 1955, 1974, 167 L.Ed.2d 929 (2007), and must plead those facts with enough specificity "to raise a right to relief above the speculative level[.]" *Id.*, 127 S.Ct. at 1965. "A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged." *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, ___ U.S. ___, 129 S.Ct. 1937, 1949, 173 L.Ed.2d 868 (2009). While a complaint need not contain detailed factual allegations, the plaintiff must allege more than labels and conclusions. *Twombly*, 127 S.Ct. at 1964-65. The court must accept all well-pleaded facts as true and view the allegations in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. *See In re Katrina Canal Breaches Litig.*, 495 F.3d 191, 205-06 (5th Cir. 2007), *cert. denied sub nom., Xavier Univ. of Louisiana v. Travelers Cas. Property Co. of America*, 128 S.Ct. 1230 (2008).

"[F]ederal courts have repeatedly held that violations of criminal statutes do not give rise to a private right of action." *Williams v. Cintas Corp.*, No. 3-07-CV-0561-M, 2007 WL 1295802 at *2 (N.D. Tex. Apr. 10, 2007) (collecting cases), *rec. adopted*, 2007 WL 1300780 (N.D. Tex. May 2, 2007). In order for a private right of action to exist, there must be "a statutory basis for inferring that


a civil cause of action of some sort lay in favor of someone." *Ali v. Shabazz*, 8 F.3d 22 (Table), 1993 WL 456323 at *1 (5th Cir. Oct. 28, 1993), *quoting Cort v. Ash*, 422 U.S. 66, 79, 95 S.Ct. 2080, 2088, 45 L.Ed.2d 26 (1975). Not only has plaintiff failed to adequately plead a violation of any state or federal criminal statute, but he cannot maintain a private right of action as a result of any such violation. *Id.*, *quoting Johnson v. Kegans*, 870 F.2d 992, 1005 n.4 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 109 S.Ct. 3250 (1989) (Goldberg, J., dissenting) (corrective process under criminal statutes "lie[s] entirely within the discretion of a governmental body"). Consequently, his complaint should be summarily dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

RECOMMENDATION

This action should be summarily dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b).

A copy of this report and recommendation shall be served on all parties in the manner provided by law. Any party who objects to any part of this report and recommendation must file specific written objections within 14 days after being served with a copy. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b). In order to be specific, an objection must identify the specific finding or recommendation to which objection is made, state the basis for the objection, and specify the place in the magistrate judge's report and recommendation where the disputed determination is found. An objection that merely incorporates by reference or refers to the briefing before the magistrate judge is not specific. Failure to file specific written objections will bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge that are accepted or adopted by the district court, except upon grounds of plain error. *See Douglass v. United Services Automobile Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996).

DATED: December 13, 2010.


JEFF KAPLAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE